

**REMARKS**

This correspondence is responsive to the Official Action mailed February 22, 2005. Claims 1-20 were examined and remain pending. The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by EP 0 806 731 A2 ("Bracho"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, but has amended the claims to be consistent with the scope of claims granted in the underlying priority case GB 2 366 160 C. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11-13, and has cancelled claims 4, 9, and 10. New claim 21 replaces claim 9.

Although the Bracho reference initially appears to have similarities with the subject matter of the present invention, upon closer examination it is readily apparent to one skilled in the art that Bracho is not even in the same specific field as the present invention. Bracho does not teach or suggest a system or method that deals with the detailed creation and aggregation of data messages to meet different specific information requirements in different situations. Instead, Bracho is directed to a more general, higher level system architecture and is not concerned with the detailed information routing system recited in applicant's claims.

Thus, Bracho describes a system that facilitates the delivery of a published message from a "publisher" to a "subscriber" in a system wherein neither publisher nor subscriber is aware of the network or physical address of the other. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of a system or method by which individual or multiple messages can be created in an aggregated sequence to fulfill a variable information request.

In contrast, the present invention is focused on the more basic processes and means by which multiple computers in networked systems are able to make available and/or exchange information, whereby the processes of creating and sequencing data messages to meet different information requirements in different situations may be automated without the need for programming specific responses to deal with each such different information requirement.

Thus, independent claims 1, 14 and 21 are believed to be patentable since Bracho does not teach or suggest an information routing system that fulfills information requests as claimed. Claims 2-3 and 5-8 are dependent from claim 1 and are patentable for the same reasons. Claims 11-13 are dependent from claim 21 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Likewise, independent claims 15 and 16 are believed to be patentable since Bracho does not teach or suggest a method for facilitating the exchange and processing of information that fulfills information requests as claimed. Claims 17-20 are dependent from claim 16 and are patentable for

the same reasons.

For all the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration to that end is solicited.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

6/22/05

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP



Richard A. Nebb  
Reg. No. 33,540

4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1450  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 705-6377 tel  
(415) 705-6383 fax  
rnebb@dergnoah.com